

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Withdrawn claims 11-20 can be considered cancelled at the allowance of any of the remaining claims.

In paragraph 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The specification specifically states, on page 7, line 17 et. seq.

Thus, upon deep embossing, the polymer component can stretch, plastically yielding without rupture to provide for a smooth, un-ruptured outer surface. Even if the underlying paper component ruptures or tears, the tear is contained by the polymer component such that the tear does not propagate and folder durability is preserved.

A reasonable reading of that passage easily supports the concept of a stretched or stretchable polymeric film.

It is believed that all claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

In paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5-10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawes Jr. et al. (US Patent No. 5275439) and Bullock (US Patent No. 6273470).

In paragraph 4 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-10 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over King (US Patent No. 3863828) and Bullock (US Patent No. 6273470).

In paragraph 5 on page 4 of the Office Action, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawes Jr. et al and Bullock or King as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bradley et al. (Us Patent No. 4867057).

The claims have been amended to positively recite the structural element of a stretched polymeric film instead of a functional step of stretching said film.

The subject matter appears to be fully searched and it is submitted that the amendment does not necessitate a new search and does not raise new issues.

The prior art does not show the stretching of polymeric film, and certainly not for preventing ruptures at embossments.

While several of the references do show the use of film on paper, none of them give the slightest hint of embossing such area and how the film would help prevent tearing. This is because none of them are directed to slip resistance but rather punch thru, which is an entirely different concept.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments and reasons provided above, it is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early allowance of all pending claims.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicant's attorney of record, Michael B. Lasky at (952) 253-4106.

Respectfully submitted,
Altera Law Group, LLC
Customer No. 22865

Date: January 14, 2008

By: /Michael Lasky/
Michael B. Lasky
Reg. No. 29,555